

Appl. No. 10/608,741

Reply to Office Action of November 1, 2005

REMARKS

In the November 1, 2005 Office Action, claims 1-4 and 13-20 were rejected, and claims 5-12 were objected to. This Response amends claims 1 and 18 and cancels claims 12 and 17 without disclaimer. After entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1-11, 13-16, and 18-20 (18 total claims; 3 independent claims) remain pending in the application. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

A. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 17 stands rejected to under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 4,534,602 (the “Bley reference”). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Nevertheless, as claim 17 has been cancelled without prejudice, this rejection rendered moot.

B. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 13-16, 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over what the Examiner characterizes as Applicant’s admitted prior art in view of the Bley reference. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify a reference or to combine the teachings of multiple references. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the prior art must teach or suggest all of the recited claim limitations. Of course, the teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in Applicant’s disclosure. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not met all of the above criteria.

The Bley reference generally discloses a zero-insertion-force multi-pin coaxial connector that uses a conductive elastomer as a frame. The conductive elastomer frame forms a shield for the coaxial connectors, and is configured to mate with one or more connector boards (see, e.g., Bley reference, Abstract).

The Bley reference, taken alone or in combination with any prior art described in the present application, fails to disclose each and every element of the claims. For example, the

Appl. No. 10/608,741

Reply to Office Action of November 1, 2005

Bley reference does not disclose an interconnect system including a "conductive elastomeric gasket electrically connecting components in contact with said conductive elastomeric gasket to reduce radio frequency coupling with one or more additional interconnects" as recited in amended claim 1. Note that claim 1 as amended includes elements of original claim 17, which the Examiner indicated was allowable.

The Bley reference merely shows a gasket 8 that surrounds coaxial connectors that extend therethrough (see, e.g., Fig. 1A). There is no suggestion that the gasket 8 connect to components to reduce RF coupling.

Similarly, none of the cited references, taken alone or in combination, disclose a "conductive elastomeric gasket for each of said plurality of openings for shielding and coupling said integration plate to a ground plane of said second module" as recited in claim 13. Nor do the references disclose "placing at least one conductive elastomeric gasket in proximity to each interconnect such that said conductive elastomeric gasket contacts said first component and a second component" as recited in amended claim 18.

In addition, Applicants disagree with Examiner's characterization of "applicant's admitted prior art" of "Figs 1-2." Specifically, the Examiner states that this alleged admitted prior art "discloses a prior art radio frequency system which would include all the claimed limitations . . . except for a conductive elastomeric gasket shielding a portion of compressible bellows interconnects." Applicants submit that this characterization and others within paragraph 5 of the Office Action are inaccurate.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that there is no motivation in either the Bley reference or the alleged admitted prior art to make the suggested combination. The simple fact that both deal with RF interconnect systems is not enough to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. It appears that Examiner is engaging in hindsight reconstruction based on the detailed description in the present invention.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejections be withdrawn with respect to the claims as amended.

Appl. No. 10/608,741

Reply to Office Action of November 1, 2005

C. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants acknowledge that original claims 5-12 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

D. Conclusion


In conclusion, for the reasons given above, all claims now presently in the application are believed allowable and such allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions or wish to further discuss this application, Applicants request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney at (480) 385-5071.

If for some reason Applicants have not requested a sufficient extension and/or have not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension necessary to prevent abandonment on this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the required time period and/or authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: December 19, 2005

By: 
Daniel R. Pote
Reg. No. 43,011
(480) 385-5071

BEST AVAILABLE COPY